



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The American Historical Review

### THE STUDY OF THE LUTHERAN REVOLT

THE dispassionate historical student who would estimate the full significance of the Protestant Revolt in Germany, and who desires to form a just opinion of the character and influence of the leaders of the time—both those who forwarded and those who opposed the revolution—finds his way beset with the most serious difficulties and dangers known to the historian. The sources for the period seem to be well-nigh vitiated by the hopeless bias of their writers. The personal abuse with which we are familiar in modern political campaigns seems affected and anæmic when compared with the robust and confident scurrility of those who headed the opposing forces in the sixteenth century. Luther, as is well known, harbored the most unmeasured contempt for his opponents. He taxes the zoölogical nomenclature of the period for invidious epithets. His enemies are lions, asses, goats, moles. He seeks in Terence, and the few classics with which he is familiar, for terms of opprobrium.<sup>1</sup> These he freely supplements by the resources of a peasant's vernacular. When the worthy Emser's reflections come to his notice, after the unpleasant discussion in Leipzig in 1519, he gives vent to his disgust that "such stupid, bungling, vapid, loud-mouthed fools should take a hand in the discussion at all."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Like Mucklewrath he discovered in the Bible a storehouse of invective. There is a curious example of this in a letter to Carlstadt in which Luther says he would never have deigned to meet Eck at all in the approaching disputation at Leipzig, *nisi pro populo Christi phrenapatas, mataelogos, authades, et aeschrocercdes oportuisse redarguere*. These singular *Schmähwörter* are adaptations from the Greek of the Epistle to Titus.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the following passage in the "Address to the German Nobility," in which Luther rivals Kent's famous tirade in *Lear*. "Dieser Muthwille und lügenhafte Vorbehalt des Papsts macht nun zu Rom ein solch Wesen, dass niemand davon reden kann. Da ist ein Kaufen, Verkaufen, Wechseln, Tauschen, Rauschen, Lügen, Trügen, Rauben, Stehlen, Prachten, Hurerei, Büberei, auf allerlei Weise Gottesverachtung, dass nicht möglich ist dem Antichrist, lästerlicher zu regieren."

The conservative party, on the other hand, was no more restrained or judicial in its utterances. To them Luther was a fellow who appeared to be "not so much a man as a wicked demon in the form of a man, clothed in the garb of a monk." He has drawn anew all the old errors from hell and collected them "in one stinking puddle." He urges the laity "to bathe their hands in the blood of the priests." He is dragging the credulous German people "in a pitiable fashion towards the abyss of damnation." "His writings breathe out nothing else than sedition, destruction, war, slaughter, rapine, and fire; they are calculated to cause the total destruction of the Christian faith, because he advocates a loose, licentious life, freed from all restraint of law and wholly brutish." These expressions are taken from well considered state papers, and are not simply the outbursts of personal spite.<sup>1</sup>

It would, in short, exhaust the rank vocabulary of an irritated Dryden or Pope merely to adumbrate in English the descriptions which each religious party has transmitted to the historian, of the character and motives of the other. For reckless scandal-mongery it would be hard to find anything more outrageous than the Protestant description of Tetzl which still has some currency, or, on the other hand, the vile anecdotes in regard to Luther which Cochlæus has handed down to successive generations of Catholic writers even to the present day. Consequently, as the student of the period descends into the arena, he is deafened by the discordant cries that reach him from every side; yet he must listen with composure and an open mind as Reuchlin and the Cologne professors, Luther, Eck, Prierius, Hutten, and the rest fill the air with mutual recriminations. He must not only listen, he must seek the truth in raging utterances in which all other considerations seem to give way before political and party animosities.

Party rancor is, of course, by no means confined to the early part of the sixteenth century; the worst of it is that the party rancor of this particular period has been perpetuated, and will be perpetuated for a long time to come. The old issues are by no means dead, especially in Germany, to which we have become accustomed to look for constant aid in solving the historical problems of the times.

The period has always had a peculiar attraction for those interested first and foremost in theology, and, with all respect to the signal contributions which have been made by writers of this sort, the general surrender to them of special research in this field has

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Decree of the Diet of Worms (1521), and a mandate of the bishop of Worms (1524).

been doubly disadvantageous from the standpoint of the historian. In the first place, just those phases of the movement have been emphasized which are still, and will be for an indefinite time to come, subjects which few can treat in a perfectly fair-minded way. In the second place, the exclusive attention to the theological and religious phases of the revolt has blinded most of the writers in the past to the equally fundamental social, political, intellectual, economic and institutional changes that accompanied the religious.

A generation ago a distinguished and eloquent German scholar, Wilhelm Maurenbrecher, prepared a remarkable review of the literature relating to the Lutheran movement that had appeared since the days of Myconius and Cochlæus down to the year 1870.<sup>1</sup> From the standpoint of the open-minded historical student who approaches the great theme with none of the predilections of the Protestant, the Catholic, or, above all, of the anti-clerical, but with some understanding of each of them, the results of Maurenbrecher's essay are far from cheering. Aside from the arid *Commentary* of Seckendorf, published in 1688, he finds little or nothing to commend in the innumerable accounts of the subject which preceded that of Ranke (1839-1848).

For the latter writer he professes the admiration which German scholars always express for Ranke, and which to some of us nowadays appears exaggerated and rather inexplicable. We must recollect, however, that the brilliancy of Ranke's work has paled by reason of the very success of the reforms which he did so much to establish in the writing of history. He should be compared, not with the best scholars of to-day, but with Schlosser, Robertson, and d'Aubigné, if we would estimate his true place in the advance of historiography. Ranke at least placed the religious movement in its political setting in a way that none of his predecessors had done. Before the appearance of his book the field had been left mainly to the theologians, who had not only failed to interest themselves in more than one phase of an extremely complex movement, but, what was worse, had each had a system to defend, so that they contributed little to that particular species of theological knowledge of which the lay historian has need.

No one doubts the essential importance of an understanding of the theological issues, even for the student who is ordinarily indifferent to questions of doctrine. But one may seek in vain in a great part of the older treatises on the Reformation, both Protestant and Catholic, for the kind of knowledge which he desires. The Protestant writer is unconsciously led to systematize the uncer-

<sup>1</sup> *Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit*. Leipzig, 1874.

tain gropings and contradictory statements of Luther and then sharply contrast this system with the alleged errors of the Roman Catholics and reconcile it as well as possible with present convictions and practices. Now there are some things in Luther's writings to shock modern susceptibilities and the good man did not always have his feet on the firm ground even of personal conviction ; hence the temptations to unhistorical suppressions and adjustments have proved irresistible. The Catholic historian, on the other hand, was confronted by different but equally dangerous pitfalls. Luther's vacillation, his abusive language, and a certain exuberance of overstatement which grieved even his friends completely obscured his greatness in the eyes of his enemies. Moreover, it seems to be practically impossible for one to whom the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church appeal to understand Luther's attitude towards religion, for otherwise why should the old preposterous motives for his conduct which were alleged in the Edict of Worms still be seriously urged ? Catholic writers have never thought of discovering similar motives to account for Paul's or Augustine's beliefs.

While no student of the Protestant Revolt can possibly pursue his work without constant reference to the doctrines of the period, he should view these not as correct or incorrect from the standpoint of a particular set of beliefs, but simply as expressions of the convictions of those with whose conduct he has to deal. "The field must be cleared," as Maurenbrecher concludes, "from all theological *Tendenzen*, whether these come from the right, left, or center. A true history of the Reformation must on principle leave altogether to one side all theological and ecclesiastical bias and partisanship."

A more tolerant spirit in regard to the theological and religious issues of the Protestant Revolt will inevitably bring with it a new estimate of their importance. Clerical historians—upon whom we have had chiefly to depend until recently, whether Protestant or Catholic, have always viewed the medieval church as first and foremost a religious institution. To a class whose main calling in life is the inculcating of religious ideas and the stimulation of religious enthusiasm, religion must naturally appear to have been a constant and determining factor in the past. Protestant writers have consequently attributed to aroused religious sentiment the secession of a considerable portion of Europe from the ancient church in the sixteenth century. While they have willingly ascribed the most heterogeneous beneficent results to the Revolt, they have been loth to admit other than spiritual causes to account for it. The partiality of the Protestant writer for religious phenomena leads him to discover just those data which serve to establish his contention.

His especial interest in religious motives leads him unconsciously to neglect or belittle the importance of all others. In this way his presentation of the case is made to appear plausible and it has until recently been generally accepted without suspicion.

The ardor of the Catholic writer has led him into an equally fatal misapprehension of the situation. His doctrinal bias blinds him to the spiritual grandeur of Luther's work. It is inconceivable to him that anything worthy of the name of religious sentiment could have produced so perverse a rebellion as that of the Protestants. He naturally tends to discover *irreligious* explanations where he should have found only *unreligious* ones. Luther's denial of freewill is ascribed, for instance, not to his study of Augustine, but to his contamination by pagan poets; his attitude towards the celibacy of the clergy to his desire to marry; his deprecation of good works to his natural tendency to licentiousness.

We appear now to be on the point of developing an idea of the scope and cause of the Protestant Revolt that differs radically from the traditional one. Recently one of our most prominent students of the history of the church ventured the assertion that the Reformation could scarcely be called a religious revolution at all. This will seem at first sight utterly paradoxical to most readers; it may certainly prove to be an over statement, but there are nevertheless weighty arguments which may be adduced in support of this conclusion.

The secular study of the medieval church is making clearer and more incontestable from day to day the truth that that institution was by no means exclusively religious. It was not only organized like a modern bureaucracy but it also performed many of the functions which have in modern times been left to the civil government. It dominated the intellectual and profoundly affected the social interests of western Europe. As an economic factor its influence was multiform and incalculable. Mr. Cunningham has very properly emphasized the economic rôle of the monasteries, and other writers, the influence of the church's teaching in regard to usury. When we consider that in the fourteenth century one-third of all the real estate in England is said to have been in the hands of the church, and that the Good Parliament complained that the taxes levied by the Pope upon his English subjects were five times as great as those exacted by the King, we gain some appreciation of the manifold ways in which the existence of the church must have deeply influenced the general economic situation.

The question naturally presents itself, did the public in Germany during the period immediately preceding the Protestant Revolt look

upon the church as a religious institution, or were people pre-occupied with the various other phases of the church's activity? There is perhaps no more striking proof that the issue with the people at large was not primarily a religious one, than that in his first and greatest appeal to the German nation, the "Address to the German Nobility," Luther scarcely adverts to religious matters at all, but deals almost exclusively with the social, financial, educational, industrial, and general moral problems of the day.

If this be true of Luther's appeal, it is far truer of Ulrich von Hutten's various pamphlets. Moreover, in the important and fascinating collection of satires and ephemeral pamphlets collected by Schade, one is constantly impressed by the absence of religious fervor and the highly secular character of the matters discussed. It is true that the writers sometimes adopted a semi-religious method of presentation. For example, we find dialogues at the gate of Heaven, letters passing between the pope and the devil, and a notable visit of St. Peter to earth. In the latter case, however, the report which the saint carries back to Heaven deals chiefly with the bad manners of the children, the difficulties of the servant problem, and other similar worldly themes. The same impression of predominatingly secular interests may be derived from the various lists of complaints drawn up by the German diets.

Whether we are more worldly than previous generations or not, is a question which I have no desire to consider here. We certainly are not so anxious as our forefathers to give a distinctly religious sanction to our secular affairs. Formerly nations negotiated with one another explicitly in the name of the Lord. The Act of the Congress of Vienna was concluded in the name of the "Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity." This does not, however, mislead us for a moment into supposing that the partition of Saxony and the assignment of Poland to the Czar were due wholly, or even chiefly, to religious motives. Ecclesiastical forms and phraseology prevailed in the Middle Ages and continued to prevail long after, and this fact may have served to obscure the essentially worldly interests of those who adhered to a conventional type of expression.

The development of political economy and sociology has attracted our attention to a new class of historical sources and is influencing our interpretation of those that have long been familiar to scholars. Another comparatively modern discovery, that of the law of historical continuity, is likely to work a fundamental change in our explanations of the Protestant Revolt. Formerly writers accounted for the Lutheran movement by so magnifying the horrors of the preëxisting régime that it appeared intolerable

and its abolition consequently inevitable. Unfortunately, this crude solution of the problem proved too much; for conditions were no worse immediately before the revolt than they had been for centuries, and a new theory was logically demanded to explain why these conditions had failed to produce a change long before it actually occurred.

In spite of the harsh criticism to which Janssen's great work on Germany in the sixteenth century<sup>1</sup> has been subjected, it is unquestionably the most important single contribution to the subject during the past thirty years. It has already profoundly and beneficently affected our conception of the whole movement. It has shaken the Protestants from their dogmatic slumber and supplied most important data to the scientifically disposed. The first volume is by far the most important, for it treats of the antecedents of the conflict and of the conditions in Germany during the fifty years preceding Luther's secession from the Roman Church. It is just this period which has been most consistently neglected, in spite of its supreme importance. Protestant writers earlier contented themselves with a brief caricature of the church, a superficial account of the traffic in indulgences, and a rough and ready assumption, which even Köstlin makes, that the darkness was greatest just before the dawn.

It was not left, however, for Janssen to give us our first insight into the spiritual life that prevailed during the latter part of the fifteenth century and the early part of the sixteenth. A humble, patient Bohemian priest, Hasak, set to work, to the great credit of his church, to bring together the devotional works published during the seventy years succeeding the invention of printing.<sup>2</sup> A consideration of his remarkable collection of tracts cannot fail to make a deep impression upon the reader who is familiar only with the conventional Protestant introductions to the Reformation. Everyone

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Freiburg im Br.). The first and perhaps the most important volume, dealing with the conditions in Germany before the opening of the Lutheran Revolt, has reached the sixteenth edition. The last half of the work, Vols. V.-VIII., relate to the conditions before the opening of the Thirty Years' War. Of late years the successive editions have been edited by Ludwig Pastor, who is now editing in addition a series of monographs, *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*. Three volumes of these monographs have appeared since 1898 and correspond in the field of Roman Catholic scholarship to the long series of *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*. The English translation of the earlier part of Janssen's work published by Herder in St. Louis unfortunately omits in great part the notes and references which form such a valuable adjunct in the German editions.

<sup>2</sup> *Der christliche Glaube des deutschen Volkes beim Schluss des Mittelalters dargestellt in deutschen Sprachdenkmalen, oder fünfzig Jahre der deutschen Sprache im Reformationszeitalter von 1470-1520*. (Regensburg, 1868.)



knows that one at least of these older books, *The German Theology*, was a great favorite of Luther's, but there are plenty more in Hasak's collection which breathe the same spirit of true piety and spiritual emulation.

Building upon the foundations of earlier contributions, like those of Hasak and other Catholic writers, who have been pretty much neglected by the Protestant historians, Janssen produced a monumental work in defense of the German Church before the Lutheran Revolt. Instead of the usual dark picture in which all that was worthy is carefully suppressed or ignored and only the vicious and deservedly unpopular features of the ecclesiastical régime are emphasized, Janssen exhibits the great achievements of the latter part of the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth century in art and literature, in the material prosperity of the towns and the spiritual life of the people. It may well be that his picture is too bright, and that in his obvious anxiety to prove the gratuitous character of the Lutheran innovations and the needlessness of an ecclesiastical revolution he has gone to the opposite extreme from the Protestants.

Yet this rehabilitation of pre-Reformation Germany cannot but make a strong appeal to the unbiased historical student, who naturally suspects that the same sort of misapprehension underlies our traditional description of the antecedents of the Protestant Revolt as underlies the old-fashioned accounts of the *ancien régime* in France. It was once commonly assumed that the French Revolution was due to conditions which were constantly growing worse, and hence more intolerable. The sources were exploited with this theory in mind. Any signs of ease, justice, or general contentment were overlooked or dismissed with a perfunctory allusion, while scandals of the court and the darker pages of Arthur Young were fondly cherished as furnishing the key to the great revulsion. It is now clear that the *ancien régime* has been treated with great unfairness. The good in the Revolution surely did not, in violation of the great law of historical continuity, come into existence all at once and without preparation. It should be the constant purpose of the historian who believes in this law to show that the Revolution, in the sense of a permanent reformation of the French government, was not the result of a frenzied rejection of what had gone before, but was the natural outcome of preceding conditions and convictions. In one sense the French Revolution, regarded as a permanent reform of earlier institutions, was practically completed by the end of 1789. It is the historian's business to show how, in view of the earlier development of public opinion, this seemingly abrupt metamorphosis of France was really gradual.

Now, in the same way we should approach and seek to explain the success of the Protestant Revolt. Outwardly it would seem to have begun when Luther finally made up his mind to burn the law and constitution of the church at the end of 1520 — an act comparable to the storming of Fort Sumter. But neither Luther's act nor the firing in Charleston Bay would have meant much had it not been for a long-elaborated public sentiment, which gave to each its historical significance. We should, therefore, to take a single instance, rejoice in the proof that Hasak and Janssen furnish of the continuity of spiritual life in Germany. The popularity of the earlier editions of the Bible is a far better explanation of the vogue of Luther's translation than the old mistaken assumption that Luther was practically the first to bring the Scriptures to the attention of the people. The constant appearance of little manuals of devotion and piety before Luther began to write his tracts serves better to explain the influence of Luther's words than the assertion that the German people were given over to mere superstition and ceremonial rites. To Janssen belongs the great credit of first illustrating the great good which must come of a careful and sympathetic study of the whole civilization of Germany in the fifteenth century.

Of the newer general accounts of the Lutheran Revolt, that of Bezold<sup>1</sup> is distinguished by its author's breadth of interest and fairness of attitude. It comes pretty near being a really satisfactory popular treatment of the subject. The entire absence of references to the authorities is, however, an unpardonable omission in the eyes of the more exacting student. One never takes up a volume of the really noble series edited by Professor Oncken, to which this belongs, without a feeling of astonishment that such distinguished scholars should have consented to devote years of labor to an enterprise deliberately planned so as to exclude all gratification of the scholar's legitimate desire to sanction his statements by appealing to the sources. The fifth volume of Creighton's monumental *History of the Papacy* gives a brilliant review of the period we are considering. The ninth volume of Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* as continued by Cardinal Hergenröther<sup>2</sup> is on the contrary distinctly disappointing.

Maurenbrecher himself undertook to remedy some of the deficiencies in the current conceptions of the Reformation by a study of the conservative movements toward reform.<sup>3</sup> The single volume

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> Freiburg im Br., 1890.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte der katholischen Reformation*, Erster Band (Nördlingen, 1880).

which he brought to completion must be reckoned among the most important of the secondary sources for the time. In spite of its incompleteness, it emphasizes a movement almost consistently neglected by Protestant writers. It is to be hoped that some scholar of Maurenbrecher's amiable temperament will undertake the task which he scarcely more than planned.

Luther himself can now be studied far more conveniently than was possible a generation ago. The handsome Weimar edition of his works, already well under way, has not only the advantage of critical editing but, owing to its strictly chronological arrangement, it meets the needs of the historical student as none of the older editions do.

In Ender's new edition of Luther's *Letters*<sup>1</sup> those sources are brought together that enable us to penetrate most deeply into the man's conflicting emotions. In the *Letters* we can trace Luther's halting development, surprise all his inconsistencies of mood, and convince ourselves of his fundamental consistency of religious feeling. From the *Letters* we can readily convince ourselves of his multiform greatness, of his bravery and his heroic pertinacity. At the same time we see clearly how constantly he gave offense even to the less ardent adherents of his cause, to say nothing of those who were sincerely in doubt as to the righteousness of his attack.

Among the biographies of Luther published during the last twenty-five years that of K stlin<sup>2</sup> holds a deservedly high place. He views his hero mainly in the light of a theologian and religious reformer, but treats him as objectively as one who is a devout Lutheran well can. In Kolde's shorter life<sup>3</sup> there are valuable hints, the outcome of his special researches in this field. His object is to "sketch Luther against the background of the general development of his nation." In an earlier work<sup>4</sup> Kolde casts much light upon the influences, especially that of Staupitz, which promoted Luther's earliest discontent with the existing ecclesiastical system. English readers have now in Beard's *Martin Luther*<sup>5</sup> a successful account of the reformer's early life and a more adequate account of the conditions in Germany at the opening of the sixteenth century than has hitherto been at their disposal.

<sup>1</sup> *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel, bearbeitet und mit Erl uterungen versehen* (Frankfurt am M., 1884). Uniform with the Frankfurt-Erlangen edition of Luther's works.

<sup>2</sup> *Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften*. (3d ed., 1883.) An abridgment of this work in one volume has been translated into English.

<sup>3</sup> *Martin Luther, eine Biographie*.

<sup>4</sup> *Die deutsche Augustiner-Congregation und Johann von Staupitz*. 1877.

<sup>5</sup> The author unfortunately did not live to complete his work, which breaks off at the close of the Diet of Worms.

The most recent and in several respects the most novel of the lives of Luther is that of Arnold Berger,<sup>1</sup> whose chosen field of work is literature, not history or theology. He regards the Protestant Revolt as "a gigantic struggle against the culture of the preceding thousand years." He would bring Luther's work into its relation with the *Laienkultur*, for this he believes to be the decisive but consistently neglected element in the general situation.

Berger prefaces his biography with a little volume called *The Culture Problems of the Reformation*,<sup>2</sup> in which he sketches the dominant ideas of the Middle Ages, dealing especially with the historical significance of the three great words, church, asceticism, and Augustinism. The advantage of such an introduction is obvious, for even if it adds nothing to the knowledge which is scattered about in a number of standard works, it presents better than any book with which I am familiar the elements that reveal the terrific meaning of the struggle in which Luther and his followers engaged. Berger recognizes more fully than most Protestant writers the all-comprehending influence of the church, which, as has been said, is too often represented as simply a religious organization. Berger's work is, however, but a suggestion of the great prolegomenon which must some time be written if we are ever to understand the Lutheran Revolt. We really know far too little as yet of the actual workings of the church before the Protestant schism. Even the ways in which it performed its religious functions are only recently becoming tolerably clear. We are really only just beginning to suspect the implications of that tremendous term—the *Medieval Church*, and so long as that term is not comprehended in all its bearings, no one can do more than guess at the real issues of the supreme conflict which led to the permanent disruption of the great international ecclesiastical state which the Roman Empire bequeathed to the Middle Ages.

Besides the Lutheran literature in the narrower sense of the word, we have an ever-increasing number of the biographies and letters of Luther's contemporaries; for instance, Reuchlin, Hutten, Erasmus, Butzer, Scheurl, Pirkheimer, Cochläus, Link; and we know far more of the Humanists than we once could. We are blessed with two editions of Mutian's letters,<sup>3</sup> but it is a pity that we should still be without a modern and critical edition of those of Erasmus.

<sup>1</sup> *Martin Luther in Kulturgeschichtliche Darstellung*. Erster Teil (1483–1525), Berlin, 1895. Zweiter Teil, erste Lieferung (1525–1532), 1898.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Kulturaufgaben der Reformation, Einleitung in eine Lutherbiographie*. Berlin, 1895.

<sup>3</sup> One edited by Krause (Kassel, 1885) and a second by Gillert (Halle, 1890).

Special questions have been the subject of monographic treatment in innumerable doctor's theses, dissertations, and in the learned journals and local historical reviews. Tetzels and indulgences have alone called forth a shelf-full of books. Mr. Henry C. Lea has reconsidered this matter and incorporated the Tetzel incident in a most elaborate and exhaustive consideration of the whole matter of confession and indulgences.<sup>1</sup>

In quite another phase of the subject, namely, the agrarian and industrial discontent and agitation, a needed revision of the older ideas is being undertaken by the Socialistic German writers. Assuredly one can hardly grudge poor Münzer and the Anabaptists a good word, for tradition has painted no one in blacker colors. The impartial student may well have guessed that they have hardly been given their due, even before he opens Kautsky's *Forerunners of Modern Socialism*.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, it is clear that a great deal has been done during the past thirty years to remedy those deficiencies of earlier writers which Maurenbrecher pointed out. Our conception of the Protestant movement has been broadened and corrected; there is no longer any excuse for failing to realize the complex character of the revolution or to form a tolerably just estimate of those who aided it and those who opposed it, as well as for largest class of all — those who looked on and refused to take sides.<sup>3</sup>

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON.

<sup>1</sup> *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*. 3 vols., Phila., 1896.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Vorläufer des Neueren Socialismus*. Stuttgart, 1895.

<sup>3</sup> After completing this paper I came with pleasure upon this passage: "There has been a natural tendency to regard the Reformation as solely a religious movement; but this is an error. In the curious theocracy which dominated the Middle Ages, secular and spiritual interests became so inextricably intermingled that it is impossible wholly to disentangle them; but the motives, both remote and proximate, which led to the Lutheran revolt were largely secular rather than spiritual." Henry C. Lea in *The Cambridge Modern History*, I. p. 653.